



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,748	02/12/2008	Takuhiro Saito	740165-442	4959
25570	7590	12/04/2009		
ROBERTS MLOTKOWSKI SAFRAN & COLE, P.C.			EXAMINER	
Intellectual Property Department			KIM, SANG K	
P.O. Box 10064			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MCLEAN, VA 22102-8064			3654	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/04/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lgallagher@rmsclaw.com
dbeltran@rmsclaw.com
bdiaz@rmsclaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/594,748	Applicant(s) SAITO ET AL.
	Examiner SANG KIM	Art Unit 3654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Pre-amdt.9/29/06.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 21-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO-1448)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/29/06 & 8/27/09

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

Claim Objections

Claims 27, 30-33 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 27, line 2, the term "they are" are objected. What constitutes "they are"?

In claim 30, line 21, "by the biasing force" is objected. Is applicant referring to the biasing force of the lock bars or a retractor spring of the spool? If applicant is referring to the retractor spring, then the phrase should refer to "by a biasing force".

In claim 30, lines 19 and 22-23, the term, "its axial line" is objected. What constitutes "its axial line"?

In claim 32, lines 16 and 18-20, the term, "its axial line" is objected. What constitutes "its axial line"?

In claim 33, lines 18 and 20-21, the term, "its axial line" is objected. What constitutes "its axial line"?

Appropriate corrections are required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 21-33 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 7533842 B2. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application and of the patent are drawn to the same invention, but differ only in specificity and obvious wording changes. The invention broadly claimed in this application is obviously encompassed by the claims of the patent.

Claims 21-33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-8 of copending Application No. 10/594902. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the two applications differing only by minor phraseology which obviously does not affect the scope of the invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (JP 2004-42782, equivalent US 2004/0075008 A1, which is now U.S. Patent No. 7108284 B2).

Mori '782 discloses a webbing retractor 10 including a spool 20, a webbing 28, a motor 44, a clutch 90, a case (see figure 4), a rotating body (e.g. gear wheel 102), sliders 146 with push pieces 154, lock bars 130 with release pieces 136 biased by spring 158, in a direction in which engages the spool through a ratchet 112, the locking bars engage and disengage with sliders (see figures 5-7), wherein the engaging, retention or engaging portions are frictionally engaged and inclined surfaces, a rotor 92, spring pawls 152 that are disposed between the gear wheel 102 and the rotor 92, see figures 1-7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SANG KIM whose telephone number is 571-272-6947.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Nguyen, can be reached on (571) 272-6952. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SK

12/1/09

/SANG KIM/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3654